

1 Joel E. Tasca
2 Nevada Bar No. 14124
3 Justin A. Shiroff
4 Nevada Bar No. 12869
5 BALLARD SPAHR LLP
6 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 900
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
8 Telephone: (702) 471-7000
9 Facsimile: (702) 471-7070
10 tasca@ballardspahr.com
11 shiroff@ballardspahr.com

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Citibank, N.A. as*
8 *Trustee for the Certificateholders of*
9 *Structured Asset Mortgage Investments II,*
10 *Inc., Bear Stearns ALT-A Trust, Mortgage*
 Pass-Through Certificates Series 2006-6 and
 Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems,
 Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CITIBANK, N.A. AS TRUSTEE FOR THE
CERTIFICATEHOLDERS OF
STRUCTURED ASSET MORTGAGE
INVESTMENTS II, INC., BEAR
STEARNS ALT-A TRUST, MORTGAGE
PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES
SERIES 2006-6

Plaintiff.

10

SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, a Nevada non-profit corporation; SEVILLE ETAGE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, a Nevada non-profit corporation.

Defendants.

SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,

Counter/Cross Claimant

vs.

CITIBANK, N.A. AS TRUSTEE FOR THE
CERTIFICATEHOLDERS OF
STRUCTURED ASSET MORTGAGE
INVESTMENTS II, INC., BEAR

Case No. 2:16-cv-02766-JCM-VCF

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
EXTEND DISCOVERY
DEADLINES**

(SECOND REQUEST)

1 STEARNS ALT-A TRUST, MORTGAGE
2 PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES
3 SERIES 2006-6; MORTGAGE
4 ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION
5 SYSTEMS, INC., AS NOMINEE FOR
REPUBLIC MORTGAGE, LLC DBA
REPUBLIC MORTGAGE; FRANKIE M.
ABENOJAR, an individual; JANE P.
ABENOJAR, an individual,

6 Counter/Cross Defendants/
7

8 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) and 6(b)(a)(1)(A) and LR 26-4, Plaintiff,
9 Citibank, N.A. as Trustee for the Certificateholders of Structured Asset Mortgage
10 Investments II, Inc., Bear Stearns ALT-A Trust, Mortgage Pass-Through
11 Certificates Series 2006-6 and Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc.
12 (“Trustee”), Defendant SFR Investment Pools 1, LLC (“SFR”), and Defendant
13 Seville Etage Homeowners Association (the “Association”) (together, the “Parties”)
14 hereby submit the following Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines
15 (Second Request).

16 Under the Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order [ECF No. 33], as amended
17 by the signed Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines [ECF No. 42.]
18 the current deadlines are as follows:

19	Discovery Cut-Off	Tuesday, January 2, 2018
20	Dispositive Motions	Thursday, February 1, 2018
21	Joint Pre-Trial Order	Thursday, March 1, 2018

23 Pursuant to LR 26-4, a stipulation to extend any dates set by the scheduling
order must be supported by a showing of good cause for the extension. “The good
24 cause inquiry focuses primarily on the movant’s diligence.” *Novotny v. Outback*
Steakhouse of Fla., LLC, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114672 at *2 (D. Nev. July 21,
25 2017) (citing *Coleman v. Quaker Oats Co.*, 232 F.3d 1271, 1294-95 (9th Cir. 2000)).
26 “Good cause to extend a discovery deadline exists ‘if it cannot reasonably be met
27
28

1 despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.” *Id.* (quoting *Johnson v.*
2 *Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)). Good cause exists
3 in this case. All of the Parties have exercised diligence with regards to completing
4 discovery. The Parties believe that a 60-day extension is warranted given the need
5 to take, defend, and prepare for the deposition of the Trustee’s 30(b)(6) witness.

6 **(a) Statement Specifying the Discovery Completed:**

7 At this point in litigation, Trustee has provided its initial disclosures, issued
8 supplemental initial disclosures, responded to SFR’s first and second set of
9 discovery requests, served and received responses to written discovery requests to
10 all Parties, and noticed the 30(b)(6) deposition of SFR’s chosen witness.

11 SFR has provided its initial disclosures and served and received responses to
12 written discovery requests to the Trustee, served a second round of written
13 discovery on the Trustee on September 29, 2017. SFR took the deposition of the
14 Trustee’s 30(b)(6) witness on December 6, 2017, but left the deposition open because
15 the Trustee had been unable to obtain certain documents about which SFR sought
16 information in advance of the noticed deposition. The parties rescheduled the
17 deposition of the Trustee’s 30(b)(6) witness for December 19, 2017. Though the
18 Trustee was able to obtain the requested documents by that date, it was unable to
19 complete its investigation about the contents of the documents by that date so as to
20 be able to respond to SFR’s questions. Accordingly, the Parties agreed to vacate the
21 deposition of the Trustee’s 30(b)(6) witness and reschedule at a later date once the
22 Trustee is able to obtain the requested information. Unfortunately, the Parties
23 were unable to find a date where counsel and the witness had availability before the
24 current close of discovery.

25 The Association has served its initial disclosures and served written
26 discovery requests to the Trustee.

27 **(b) Specific Description of the Discovery that Remains to be Completed**

Once Trustee finalizes its responses to written discovery requests issued by the HOA, the Trustee needs to provide these responses.

The 30(b)(6) deposition of the Trustee's chosen witness needs to be continued to a later date because SFR has asked for the witness to be prepared to answer questions about the content and context of certain documents, and the Trustee has agreed to investigate and attempt to obtain this information in advance of the 30(b)(6) deposition. Given witness and counsel availability, such an extension will require at a minimum a 30-day extension of discovery, and to be sure the relevant schedules can be accommodated, the Parties would prefer a 60-day extension of the close of discovery.

(c) The Reasons Why Remaining Discovery Was Not Completed

Despite their diligence in completing discovery in this case, the Parties have been unable to arrive at a mutually agreeable deposition date for the continued deposition of the Trustee's 30(b)(6) witness due to trial demands and depositions in other matters. Additionally, the Trustee requires additional time to investigate and obtain the information about which SFR seeks to ask questions. The Parties believe an additional 60 days will provide adequate time to conduct the depositions of Trustee's 30(b)(6) witness.

(d) Proposed Schedule for Completing All Remaining Discovery

The Parties propose a 60-day extension of the remaining discovery dates as follows:

Discovery Cut-Off	Monday, March 5, 2018
Dispositive Motions	Wednesday, April 4, 2018
Joint Pre-Trial Order	Friday, May 4, 2018

CONCLUSION

2 For the above-stated reasons, the Parties respectfully request that this Court
3 enter an Order granting this Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines
4 (Second Request) using the new deadlines noted above.

5 | Dated: January 2, 2018.

BALLARD SPAHR LLP

8 By: /s/ Justin A. Shiroff
9 Abran E. Vigil, NV Bar No. 7548
Justin A. Shiroff, NV Bar No. 12869
1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Citibank, N.A.*
12 *as Trustee for the Certificateholders of*
13 *Structured Asset Mortgage*
14 *Investments II, Inc., Bear Stearns*
15 *ALT-A Trust, Mortgage Pass-Through*
16 *Certificates Series 2006-6 and*
17 *Mortgage Electronic Registration*
18 *Systems, Inc.*

KIM GILBERT EBRON

17 By: /s/ Diana S. Ebron
Diana S. Ebron, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10580
18 Jacqueline A. Gilbert, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10593
Karen L. Hanks, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9578
19 7625 Dean Martin Drive, Suite 110
20 Las Vegas Nevada 89139

22 Attorneys for SFR Investments Pool 1,
LLC

LIPSON NEILSON COLE SELTZER & GARIN,
P.C.

By: /s/ David T. Ochoa
Kaleb D. Anderson, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 07582
David T. Ochoa, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10414
9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

*Attorney for Defendant Seville Etage
Homeowners Association*

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: 1-4-2018